



Saint Paul Planning Commission

City Hall Conference Center Room 40
15 Kellogg Boulevard West

Steering Committee Meeting – 8:00 a.m., Room 41

Christopher B. Coleman,
Mayor

Agenda

Saint Paul
Planning Commission

June 24, 2011
8:30 – 11:00 a.m.

Chair
Jon Commers
First Vice Chair
Barbara A. Wencil
Second Vice Chair
Paula Merrigan
Secretary
Anthony Fernandez

I. Approval of minutes of June 10, 2011

II. Chair's Announcements

III. Planning Director's Announcements

IV. PUBLIC HEARING: Smith Avenue Revitalization Plan – Item from the Neighborhood Planning Committee. (Kate Reilly, 651/266-6618)

V. Zoning Committee

SITE PLAN REVIEW – List of current applications. (Tom Beach, 651/266-9086)

OLD BUSINESS

#11-129-965 Capitol Lien & Title – Determination of similar use for vertical wind turbines in the B3 general business district. 1010 Dale Street North, between Lawson and Hatch. (Kate Reilly, 651/266-6618)

NEW BUSINESS

#11-149-363 Nuchami Hurshuajer – Re-establishment of nonconforming use as a duplex. 393 Geranium Avenue East, NW corner at Arkwright. (Sarah Zorn, 651/266-6570)

#11-148-456 City House – Re-establishment of nonconforming use as a reception hall in the FW Floodway District. 258 Mill Street south side of intersection of Walnut and Mill Street. (Josh Williams, 651/266-6659)

#11-148-409 City House – Conditional Use Permit for a reception hall. 258 Mill Street south side of intersection of Walnut and Mill Street. (Josh Williams, 651/266-6659)

VI. Comprehensive Planning Committee

VII. Neighborhood Planning Committee

VIII. Transportation Committee

Regional Solicitation of Federal Transportation Projects - Adopt resolution recommending approval to the City Council. (Emily Goodman, 651/266-6059)

Pat Connolly
Gene Gelgelu
Bree Halverson
Richard Kramer
Gaius Nelson
Christopher Ochs
Trevor Oliver
Julie Perrus
Marilyn Porter
Elizabeth Reveal
Anthony Schertler
Robert Spaulding
Terri Thao
Jun-Li Wang
Daniel Ward II
David Wickiser
Roxanne Young

Planning Director
Donna Drummond

- IX. **Saint Paul's Neighborhood Stabilization Program** – Informational presentation on current status by Joe Musolf and Allen Carlson, PED staff. (*Joe Musolf, 651/266-6594, and Allen Carlson, 651/266-6616*)
- X. **Communications Committee**
- XI. **Task Force Reports**
- XII. **Old Business**
- XIII. **New Business**
- XIV. **Adjournment**

Information on agenda items being considered by the Planning Commission and its committees can be found at www.stpaul.gov/ped, click on Planning.

Planning Commission Members: PLEASE call Sonja Butler, 651/266-6573, if unable to attend.

**Saint Paul Planning Commission &
Heritage Preservation Commission**
MASTER MEETING CALENDAR

WEEK OF JUNE 20-24, 2011

Mon (20)

Tues (21)

4:00- Comprehensive Planning Committee
5:30 p.m. (*Penelope Simison, 651/266-6554*)

HAS BEEN CANCELLED

Weds (22)

Thurs (23)

5:00 p.m. Heritage Preservation Commission

Room 40 City Hall
Lower Level
Enter building on 4th Street
15 W. Kellogg Blvd.

Permit Review/Public Hearings

260 Fifth Street East, Lowertown Historic District, by Diane Nordquist, City of Saint Paul – HRA, for permits to install mosaic art panels above the first floor windows at the Wall and Fifth Street facades along with custom exterior light fixtures. HPC File #11-019 (*Spong, 651/266-6714*)

Fri (24)

8:00 a.m. Planning Commission Steering Committee
(*Donna Drummond, 651/266-6556*)

Room 41 City Hall
Conference Center
15 Kellogg Blvd.

8:30- Planning Commission Meeting
11:00 a.m. (*Donna Drummond, 651/266-6556*)

Room 40 City Hall
Conference Center
15 Kellogg Blvd.

PUBLIC HEARING: Smith Avenue Revitalization Plan – Item from the Neighborhood Planning Committee. (*Kate Reilly, 651/266-6618*)

Zoning..... SITE PLAN REVIEW – List of current applications. (*Tom Beach, 651/266-9086*)

OLD BUSINESS

#11-129-965 Capitol Lien & Title – Determination of similar use for vertical wind turbines in the B3 general business district. 1010 Dale Street North, between Lawson and Hatch. (*Kate Reilly, 651/266-6618*)

NEW BUSINESS

#11-149-363 Nuchami Hurshuajer – Re-establishment of nonconforming use as a duplex. 393 Geranium Avenue East, NW corner at Arkwright. (*Sarah Zorn, 651/266-6570*)

#11-148-456 City House – Re-establishment of nonconforming use as a reception hall in the FW Floodway District. 258 Mill Street south side of intersection of Walnut and Mill Street. (*Josh Williams, 651/266-6659*)

#11-148-409 City House – Conditional Use Permit for a reception hall. 258 Mill Street south side of intersection of Walnut and Mill Street. (*Josh Williams, 651/266-6659*)

Transportation Committee..... Regional Solicitation of Federal Transportation Projects - Adopt resolution recommending approval to the City Council. (*Emily Goodman, 651/266-6059*)

Informational Presentation.... Saint Paul's Neighborhood Stabilization Program – Informational presentation on current status by Joe Musolf and Allen Carlson, PED staff. (*Joe Musolf, 651/266-6594, and Allen Carlson, 651/266-6616*)

**Saint Paul Planning Commission
City Hall Conference Center
15 Kellogg Boulevard West**

Minutes June 10, 2011

A meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Saint Paul was held Friday, June 10, 2011, at 8:30 a.m. in the Conference Center of City Hall.

Commissioners Present: Mmes. Halverson, Perrus, Reveal, Thao, Young; and Messrs. Commers, Connolly, Fernandez, Gelgelu, Kramer, Nelson, Ochs, Oliver, Spaulding, and Ward.

Commissioners Absent: Mmes. *Merrigan, *Porter, *Wang, *Wencl, and Messrs. *Schertler, and *Wickiser.

*Excused

Also Present: Donna Drummond, Planning Director; Lucy Thompson, Penelope Simison, Sarah Zorn, Kate Reilly, Jessica Rosenfeld, Josh Williams, Ryan Kelley, and Sonja Butler, Department of Planning and Economic Development staff.

I. Approval of minutes May 27, 2011.

Chair Commers requested that on page 4, paragraph 4 of the May 27th minutes that Commissioner Schertler's question and the response to the question be clarified.

MOTION: *Commissioner Reveal moved approval of the minutes of May 27, 2011 as amended. Commissioner Thao seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.*

II. Chair's Announcements

Chair Commers announced that on Thursday, June 16th at 5:00 p.m. the unveiling of the Great River Park Master Plan will take place at Harriet Island. The Mayor's office is requesting RSVPs from those planning on attending.

III. Planning Director's Announcements

Donna Drummond requested that the commissioners get their biographies submitted to her within the next week so that the biographies can be finalized.

IV. Zoning Committee

SITE PLAN REVIEW – List of current applications. *(Tom Beach, 651/266-9086)*

Four items came before the staff Site Plan Review Committee on June 7, 2011. Yang Parking Lot at 1046 Rice Street, pave existing dirt lot, add curb cut, rain garden, new patio and lighting;

Hancock – Hamline School Parking lot at 1599 Englewood Avenue, modify parking lots and drop-off lane; Academia Caesar Chavez at 1800 Ames Avenue, 4 classroom modular building; Strategic Materials at 195 Minnehaha Avenue East, modify existing rail spur structures to accommodate rail car loading/unloading needs.

One item will come before the staff Site Plan Review Committee on June 14, 2011. Laurel Apts Parking lot #3 at 2057 Laurel Avenue, new asphalt on existing gravel lot.

NEW BUSINESS

#11-140-713 Forrest Lehman – Re-establishment of nonconforming use as a duplex. 859 Hoyt Avenue West. (Sarah Zorn, 651/266-6570)

MOTION: Commissioner Kramer moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the re-establishment of nonconforming use subject to additional conditions. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.

#11-141-752 Gary Blair – Establishment of Legal Nonconforming Use for outdoor storage in a semi trailer. 1121 Minnehaha Avenue East, NE corner at Frank. (Josh Williams, 651/266-6659)

MOTION: Commissioner Kramer moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the establishment of legal nonconforming use subject to additional conditions. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.

#11-141-212 Renaissance Fireworks Inc – Conditional Use Permit for seasonal outdoor sale of consumer fireworks with modification of days operation. 1674 Suburban Avenue, SE corner of intersection with Kennard. (Kate Reilly, 651/266-6618)

MOTION: Commissioner Kramer moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the conditional use permit subject to additional conditions. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.

Commissioner Kramer announced the items on the agenda for the next Zoning Committee meeting on Thursday, June 16, 2011.

V. Comprehensive Planning Committee

No report.

VI. Neighborhood Planning Committee

District 6 Small Area Plan 40-Acre Study – Approve resolution to initiate a zoning study. (Penelope Simison, 651/266-6554)

Commissioner Nelson said that in March the Planning Commission initiated preparation of a district-wide small area plan for District 6 that is intended to include three major components: including the still-relevant policies from adopted small area plans within District 6; strategies for Como/Front/Dale, which is a Neighborhood Center identified in the Comprehensive Plan; and, strategies for the industrial areas that, in part, address the conflicts between existing residential

and industrial uses on industrially zoned land. The industrially-zoned area includes larger and smaller industrial businesses, both those developed relatively recently and long-standing businesses that have been in operation for many years. District 6 is concerned about the number of residential uses within the industrial area, the conflicts between these disparate uses, as well as the impacts of the industrial area on adjacent residential neighborhoods.

A community based task force, authorized by the Commission in March, has been discussing approaches for dealing with the residential-industrial conflicts. Even though the discussions are continuing, it has become clear that any approaches for addressing the conflicts are likely to require zone changes within the study area. Consequently, it is necessary to initiate a 40-acre study so that possible zone changes can be scrutinized fully.

MOTION: *Commissioner Nelson moved the Neighborhood Planning Committee's recommendation to approve the resolution initiating a plan and zoning study. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.*

District 9 Residential Zoning Study - Release for public review and set public hearing for July 22, 2011. (Jessica Rosenfeld, 651/266-6560)

Jessica Rosenfeld, PED staff, presented the District 9 Residential Zoning Study. The zoning study was requested by City Council because of a concern that single family homes were being converted into duplexes and triplexes. The current zoning of the area is RT2 and RM3; the current land use is mostly single-family homes with some duplexes, triplexes, and 4-plexes, and a few larger blocks of multi-family housing. The zoning study only looks at the residential land uses and the residential zoning. The staff analysis of the area found that there are a lot fewer duplexes, triplexes and small multi-family housing than were there 25 years ago. The draft District 9 Residential Zoning Study includes five maps showing residential land uses (Map 1), current zoning (Map 2), minimum lot size requirements for duplexes (Map 3), proposed zoning (Map 4), and duplexes and triplexes that would become nonconforming in the proposed R4 zones.

Chair Commers said that 44 duplex/triplex properties would become nonconforming under the proposed R4 zoning. Has there been any discussion about the availability of lending for owners of properties that become nonconforming, as there was during the Central Corridor zoning process? Rosenfeld said that the availability of lending was not discussed.

Ms. Drummond, Planning Director, added that they discussed nonconforming properties with several lenders at the time of the Central Corridor Zoning Study. The banks they talked to indicated that non-conforming status is not a concern for an existing use. The only concern is if a use is nonconforming and is vacant for more than a year that it has to be re-established.

Commissioner Spaulding asked if all of the properties that would become nonconforming were ones built as single family homes and converted to duplexes.

Ms. Rosenfeld said yes, at least that is the way they appeared from an exterior visual inspection during the field work.

MOTION: *On behalf of the Neighborhood Planning Committee, Commissioner Nelson moved to release the draft for public review and set a public hearing on July 22, 2011. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.*

District 9 Commercial Zoning Study - Release for public review and set public hearing for July 22, 2011. (Lucy Thompson, 651/266-6578)

Lucy Thompson, PED staff, said the primary purpose of the study is to look at the consistency of existing zoning and land use with the jobs, economic development and housing strategies in the recently-adopted *District 9 Area Plan*. In particular, there are two groups of parcels of concern to the neighborhood: the Kraus Anderson properties across Grand/Ramsey from United/Children's Hospitals (with a concern regarding the encroachment of hospital buildings across Grand/Ramsey), and the vacant tire repair shop on W. 7th (with a concern for future land use of this parcel immediately adjacent to residential uses). Most of the commercial zoning along W. 7th east of Smith Avenue is B3; west of Smith Avenue, it is B2. All residentially-zoned parcels were specifically excluded from the commercial zoning study. The parcels recommended for rezoning to T1 in the D9 Residential Zoning Study will be a good transition zone between the T2 being recommended in the D9 Commercial Zoning Study and the adjacent residential parcels. Several parcels in the Commercial Zoning Study are used by Bonfe's Auto Body and Mechanical Service, currently zoned B3. The auto body business is legally non-conforming under B3; this status would not change with a rezoning to T2. The auto repair business is currently conforming and would become legally nonconforming with the change to T2. Not only is T2 a better fit with *District 9 Area Plan* goals and strategies, and desired future land use in the neighborhood, but it also brings with it compliance with design guidelines that relate very closely to the Fort Road Design Guidelines. T2 is a nice fit between land use, density and the ability to incorporate design guidelines into future development.

Donna Drummond, Planning Director, added that there were two separate resolutions and ordinances that were passed by the City Council requesting the residential and the commercial zoning studies, which is why these are being done separately. A moratorium was also passed at the time the studies were initiated; the moratorium expires on October 27, 2011.

Commissioner Nelson asked whether, since this area is close to downtown and the Xcel Centre, there was any discussion about T3, especially since there is a lot of parking at Smith, Ramsey and W. 7th, and it might make sense to achieve a little higher density than T2.

Ms. Thompson said that West 7th between Grand, Ramsey and downtown is zoned T2, so this would simply be a continuation of existing zoning. If anything, T3 might be more appropriate closer to Kellogg Boulevard, but not this far out on W. 7th. In addition, the neighborhood fabric immediately behind this part of W. 7th is mostly single-family and duplex residential, and T2 is a better transition between the commercial corridor and adjacent residential, in terms of both land use and density.

Commissioner Nelson said that he has had experience with the T3 in the Victoria Park urban village. Ms. Thompson explained that Victoria Park is different because it is a 65-acre ex-industrial site that is large enough to accommodate new streets to "reweave" the urban village back into the larger neighborhood; just the sort of situation T3 is intended to address. Also, there is a lot of sensitivity in the Fort Road Federation neighborhood about the relationship between businesses on W. 7th and the adjacent residential fabric. T2 makes sense from a planning standpoint, but it's also the most politically viable way to go.

Commissioner Connolly asked for more explanation of District 9's or the neighborhood's concerns about the hospital expanding and whether they have similar concerns about Bonfe, since Bonfe owns a big chunk of land.

Ms. Thompson has not heard concerns about Bonfe, the concern about the hospital goes back twenty years or more. The concern is the encroachment of big-footprint, intensive hospital buildings across W. 7th and Grand/Ramsey that might destroy or negatively impact both the scale and type of uses along W. 7th and bordering Irvine Park. There is a verbal agreement between the hospital and Federation that there would not be expansion across either of these streets.

MOTION: On behalf of the Neighborhood Planning Committee, Commissioner Nelson moved to release the draft for public review and set a public hearing on July 22, 2011. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.

Commissioner Nelson announced that the next Neighborhood Planning Committee meeting on Wednesday, June 15th has been cancelled.

VII. Central Corridor Brownfields Assessment Project – Informational presentation on current status by Josh Williams, PED staff. *(Josh Williams, 651/266-6659)*

Josh Williams, PED staff gave an update on the Central Corridor Brownfields Assessment Project, which is being funded with a grant from U.S. EPA. The City wanted to go out and get some resources for brownfield investigation. The EPA's definition of a brownfield is any property with either known contamination or suspected contamination that has inhibited redevelopment or full use of the property. That applies to a lot of properties in an urban corridor like the Central Corridor. There is a high likelihood in a city that has been developed for over 100 years that there will be some issues with contamination. By joining together with the partners on the light rail transit line (Met Council and Ramsey County) the City was able to apply for and receive a one million dollar grant which will allow investigation of approximately 20-25 properties along Central Corridor. There are also some funds to help engage the community and educate it about environmental assessment and some of the issues associated with contamination.

Mr. Williams talked about the project area, which has a large number of sites and is equivalent to the 'area of change' defined in the Central Corridor Development Strategy, similar to the area where zoning changes were recently enacted. There is a legacy of contamination whether it is from industrial uses, auto related uses, or retail uses like dry cleaners. In the past businesses were not as careful as they are today about how chemicals like oil and solvents are disposed. There are also environmental justice issues in terms of the distribution of these contaminated properties. It tends to be found in communities that already have challenges facing them. Public health can also be put at risk; people live in these communities and if there is contamination on a site there is potential for exposure. Contaminants can be released as redevelopment occurs, so protecting the public health is a part of this.

The goal is to create a pipeline of sites. Once the sites are investigated and the type of contamination is determined a plan can be put together for clean-up. Then funds can be found to accomplish that clean-up. At this point knowing what the reuse of the site will be is key. Clean-up can be funded through various government programs but the awarding of those funds is tied to being able to show what the future use of the site will be.

These are the criteria that have been identified to select sites: 1) risk to human health; 2) development potential to fulfill the vision for the corridor; 3) readiness to develop; and 4) meeting affordable housing needs.

Currently there are four sites that are enrolled in the program and three additional properties are being evaluated for program eligibility. There are also two other sites with multiple properties that will be participating at some point in the future. It has taken a while from the time the funds were awarded to get things rolling but they are moving forward now and it is very positive.

Commissioner Connolly said that through his employer, he was aware of a church in Minneapolis that was working on redevelopment of a church parking lot. They received a similar type of funding to investigate the site and basically it looks like the church is going to be left with a problem to clean-up. And that was never the intent. The intent was to find out what the scope of the potential problem would be once development happened. Since then project has been scrapped. Commissioner Connolly wanted to know if there is something in place that would prevent owners from being left to deal with something that they never intended to have to deal with it.

Mr. Williams said that there is a risk in doing assessments that something will be found, and having to be faced with clean-up. The hope is that in being careful about evaluating project readiness that they will be in a position to find a way to make that clean-up happen.

Commissioner Connolly asked if part of the analysis include identifying specific sources of funds that could be brought to bear if the problem is bigger than anticipated or is it up to the owner to find the funds.

Williams said that the intent is to make sure that these projects are well positioned to compete with whatever funds are out there. And in talking with people who are considering using these funds for the assessment they are told that if their site is assessed, then the City is committing staff time to help find those additional resources for cleanup.

Commissioner Thao said currently the four properties are commercial properties, would any residential properties be considered for the Brownfields?

Mr. Williams said given how they define the project area there are not many solely residential properties in it. It's less likely but there is nothing in the guidelines or the way they are approaching this that would prevent participation of residential properties.

Commissioner Ochs commented on Commissioner Connolly and Thao's points. Connolly's point is that there should be a plan to back-up what some of these findings might be as these studies/findings could create an economic condition for any property owner that they were not prepared for. Contamination could be found on a site and no funds are available to help remedy it and it was not the current owner's responsibility yet they are expected to clean it up or be branded with having contaminated property. The owner may or may not be able to sell or do business at that point. So hopefully a way can be found to work with the community and some further investigation to help find resources so that a plan of action could be taken in the event an issue is found. In reference to Commissioner Thao's statement, the City might be hand selecting specific sites for assessment and it may not be fair to those who do not get selected. Commissioner Ochs thinks a sample area of residential areas could be examined as well because while there may not

be any particular industry on some of these zones, there may have been disposals of mercury or other things like that and these elements are found in their soil. So if the City is doing an assessment on the conditions of soils then more fair treatment should be given to the study area as a whole and provide a program or some sort of outlet.

Mr. Williams said in terms of funds for clean-up there is nothing they can do to prevent a case where something unexpected is found and it's difficult to find clean-up funds, but they are doing what they can to structure their program so that the assessments they are funding are going to be well positioned to compete for funds. And if it is of such a magnitude that it generates a really costly clean-up then the likelihood is it is a severe problem and will move up the ladder in terms of eligibility for funding. For example: PCA or EPA steps in on sites and if there is a severe problem that is impacting public health because exposure to contamination is happening then those are the sites that they are going to work on. Williams view is that contamination information on properties is going to come out eventually because in this day and age nothing can be done to a property, even selling it with out an investigation being done. And if there is a high level of contamination there will be a sign and when the lender or purchaser is doing their due diligence there will be something that raises a red flag. Whether it is discovered now or later it is going to come out. This also allows the City to keep an eye on it and maybe put some funds together and start to deal with it. Ultimately, it's not about dollars but about getting things cleaned up properly.

In regards to residential properties there are a couple of things to consider. There is one million dollars for this and in the end that is not enough to deal with every property. So decisions were made on how to allocate that money and staff tried to size the project area to be consistent with the amount of funds available. The other piece is the project area is consistent with where the City is directing its policy to catalyze redevelopment. That redevelopment area is drawn in a way that it avoids most of the traditional residential areas, in terms of solely residential uses. Most of the areas of single family housing or largely residential housing have only been housing. So the likelihood of contamination from some commercial use is much lower. Williams said they are considering an 'area-wide' study, which they've discussed with the EPA, but made a decision that they are not going to get their work program amended through EPA in order to pursue this option until they have investigation of a few properties with project funds completed.

Commissioner Ochs suggested that this broader area-wide study approach be used for future studies. An overall goal would be to create an assessment of the entire city and it gets done in pieces as specific studies are done and eventually there is a good analysis of the whole city and future problems can be addressed ahead of time.

VIII. Transportation Committee

Commissioner Spaulding announced the items on the agenda for the next Transportation Committee meeting on Monday, June 13, 2011.

IX. Communications Committee

No report.

X. Task Force Reports

None.

XI. Old Business

None.

XII. New Business

None.

XIII. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:48 a.m.

Recorded and prepared by
Sonja Butler, Planning Commission Secretary
Planning and Economic Development Department,
City of Saint Paul

Respectfully submitted,



Donna Drummond
Planning Director

Approved _____
(Date)

Anthony Fernandez
Secretary of the Planning Commission



CITY OF SAINT PAUL
Christopher B. Coleman, Mayor

375 Jackson Street, Suite 220
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101-1806

Telephone: 651-266-8989
Facsimile: 651-266-9124
Web: www.stpaul.gov/dsi

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

TUESDAY June 21, 2011

2nd Floor Conference Room

375 Jackson Street, Suite 218

Time	Project Name and Location
------	---------------------------

9:30	St. Paul Federal Credit Union Add drive thru window & lane, reorganize parking, and rebuild lot 1664 University Ave W.
------	--

To Applicants:

You should plan to attend this meeting.

At this meeting you will have a chance to discuss the site plan for your project with Saint Paul's Site Plan Review Committee. The Committee is made up of City staff from Zoning, Traffic, Sewers, Water, Public Works, Fire, and Parks. You are encouraged to bring your engineer, architect, or contractor with you to handle any technical questions raised by city staff.

The purpose of this meeting is to simplify the review process by letting the applicant meet with staff from a number of departments at one time. Staff will make comments and ask questions based on their review of the plans. By the end of the meeting you will know if the site plan can be approved as submitted or if revisions will be required. Staff will take minutes at the meeting and send you a copy.

Parking

Parking is available at on-street meters. Some off-street parking spaces are available in our visitor parking lot off of 6th Street at Jackson.

To see a map of additional nearby parking ramps go to
<http://www.ci.stpaul.mn.us/depts/dsi/liep/info/location.html>

If you have any questions, please call Mary Montgomery at 651-266-9088 or
mary.montgomery@ci.stpaul.mn.us.



CITY OF SAINT PAUL
Christopher B. Coleman, Mayor

375 Jackson Street, Suite 220
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101-1806

Telephone: 651-266-8989
Facsimile: 651-266-9124
Web: www.stpaul.gov/dsi

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

TUESDAY June 28, 2011

2nd Floor Conference Room

375 Jackson Street, Suite 218

<u>Time</u>	<u>Project Name and Location</u>
-------------	----------------------------------

9:30	Celtic Junction Parking Lot 836 Prior Ave N. Addition and Remodeling
------	--

To Applicants:

You should plan to attend this meeting.

At this meeting you will have a chance to discuss the site plan for your project with Saint Paul's Site Plan Review Committee. The Committee is made up of City staff from Zoning, Traffic, Sewers, Water, Public Works, Fire, and Parks. You are encouraged to bring your engineer, architect, or contractor with you to handle any technical questions raised by city staff.

The purpose of this meeting is to simplify the review process by letting the applicant meet with staff from a number of departments at one time. Staff will make comments and ask questions based on their review of the plans. By the end of the meeting you will know if the site plan can be approved as submitted or if revisions will be required. Staff will take minutes at the meeting and send you a copy.

Parking

Parking is available at on-street meters. Some off-street parking spaces are available in our visitor parking lot off of 6th Street at Jackson.

To see a map of additional nearby parking ramps go to
<http://www.ci.stpaul.mn.us/depts/dsi/liep/info/location.html>

If you have any questions, please call Mary Montgomery at 651-266-9088 or
mary.montgomery@ci.stpaul.mn.us.



CITY OF SAINT PAUL
Christopher B. Coleman, Mayor

*25 West Fourth Street
Saint Paul, MN 55102*

*Telephone: 651-266-6565
Facsimile: 651-228-3261*

To: Planning Commission

From: Neighborhood Planning Committee

Date: June 17, 2011

Re: **Smith Avenue Revitalization Plan**

Introduction

The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the Smith Avenue Revitalization Plan on June 24th. You received a full color copy of the plan in the Planning Commission packet of May 13th when the plan was released for public review and the public hearing was scheduled. Please bring this copy to the meeting if you'd like to refer to it at the public hearing.

Background

The Smith Avenue Revitalization Plan addresses the area of Smith Avenue between the High Bridge and Dodd Road in West Saint Paul. The plan was created through a Task Force process between February 2010 and December 2010. The Task Force was a joint committee with representation from both Saint Paul and West Saint Paul and represented business owners and residents alike. West Saint Paul Planner Ben Boike also worked on this plan and the West Saint Paul Planning Commission and City Council will consider adopting the portions of this plan that pertain to that city as well.

Four public meetings were held regarding the plan and its related branding guide. Task Force meetings were held once or twice per month depending upon how much ground needed to be covered that month. Planning staff coordinated with other city staff in preparing this plan.

On April 11th the West Side Citizens' Organization (WSCO) approved the draft version of the Smith Avenue Revitalization Plan and recommended it to the Planning Commission.



CITY OF SAINT PAUL
Christopher B. Coleman, Mayor

25 West Fourth Street
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Telephone: 651-266-6700
Facsimile: 651-228-3220

DATE: June 17, 2011
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Zoning Committee
SUBJECT: Results of June 16, 2011 Zoning Committee Hearing

OLD BUSINESS

1. **Capitol Lien & Title (11-129-965)**
Determination of similar use for vertical wind turbines in the B3 general business district

Address: 1010 Dale St N
Between Lawson and Hatch

District Comment: District 6 recommended approval

Support: 0 people spoke, 0 letters

Opposition: 0 people spoke, 0 letters

Hearing: Hearing is closed

Motion: Approval with conditions

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Recommendation</u> <u>Committee</u>
--------------	---

Approval with conditions	Approval with conditions (7 - 0)
--------------------------	---------------------------------------

NEW BUSINESS

2. **Nuchami Hurshuajer (11-149-363)**
Re-Establishment of nonconforming use as a duplex

Address: 393 Geranium Ave E
NW corner at Arkwright

District Comment: District 5 recommended approval

Support: 0 people spoke, 1 letter

Opposition: 0 people spoke, 0 letters

Hearing: Hearing is closed

Motion: Approval with conditions

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Recommendation</u> <u>Committee</u>
--------------	---

Approval with conditions	Approval with conditions (7 - 0)
--------------------------	---------------------------------------

		<u>Staff</u>	<u>Recommendation</u> <u>Committee</u>
3.	City House (11-148-456) Re-establishment of nonconforming use as a reception hall in the FW Floodway District	Approval	Laid over (7 - 0)

Address: 258 Mill St
south side of intersection of Walnut and Mill
Street

District Comment: District 9 had not responded

Support: 1 person spoke, 1 letter

Opposition: 4 people spoke, 11 letters

Hearing: Hearing is open

Motion: Laid over to July 14, 2011

		<u>Staff</u>	<u>Recommendation</u> <u>Committee</u>
4.	City House (11-148-409) Conditional Use Permit for a reception hall	Approval	Laid over (7 - 0)

Address: 258 Mill St
south side of intersection of Walnut and Mill
Street

District Comment: District 9 had not responded

Support: 1 person spoke, 1 letter

Opposition: 4 people spoke, 11 letters

Hearing: Hearing is open

Motion: Laid over to July 14, 2011

city of saint paul
planning commission resolution
file number _____
date _____

WHEREAS, Nuchami Hurshuajer, File # 11-149-363, has applied for a re-establishment of nonconforming use as a duplex under the provisions of §62.109 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code, on property located at 393 Geranium Ave E, Parcel Identification Number (PIN) 292922220046, legally described as John Mongans Stewart Park Add Ex W 50 Ft Lots 1 & 2 & All Of Lot 3; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission, on June 16, 2011, held a public hearing at which all persons present were given an opportunity to be heard pursuant to said application in accordance with the requirements of §61.303 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code; and

WHEREAS, the Saint Paul Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented to its Zoning Committee at the public hearing as substantially reflected in the minutes, made the following findings of fact:

1. The property was placed on the Vacant Building list in April of 2009 as a Category 2 and has been vacant for more than 365 days, requiring the applicant to re-establish the duplex use. The applicant is proposing to rehabilitate the structure as a two-family dwelling and rent it out.
2. Section 62.109(e) states: *When a nonconforming use of a structure, or structure and land in combination, is discontinued or ceases to exist for a continuous period of three hundred sixty-five (365) days, the planning commission may permit the reestablishment of a nonconforming use if the commission makes the following findings:*
 - (1) *The structure, or structure and land in combination, cannot reasonably or economically be used for a conforming purpose.* This finding is met. According to city records the property has been registered in the past as a two-unit structure and information provided by the applicant shows that the structure is configured as such. In addition, the land use map from the 1960s shows the property as a duplex. According to the pro forma submitted by the applicant, both a one and two unit structure result in positive cash flow; however, the use of the structure as a duplex will generate a higher annual profit.
 - (2) *The proposed use is equally appropriate or more appropriate to the district than the previous nonconforming use.* This finding is met. The proposed use as a duplex is equally appropriate to the district as the previous duplex use.
 - (3) *The proposed use will not be detrimental to the existing character of development in the immediate neighborhood or endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare.* This finding is met. The proposed use will not be detrimental to the existing character of development in the immediate neighborhood. Re-establishing the nonconforming use will put a structure back into service that has been vacant for the last two years. The proposed continued use of the duplex structure fits in with the surrounding neighborhood and adjacent single and two family structures.
 - (4) *The proposed use is consistent with the comprehensive plan.* This finding is met. The Housing Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan supports an increase in housing choice (strategy H1.1)

moved by _____

seconded by _____

in favor _____

against _____

across the city to support economically diverse neighborhoods.

- (5) *A notarized petition of two-thirds of the property owners within one hundred (100) feet of the property has been submitted stating their support for the use. This finding is met. The petition was found sufficient on June 1, 2011: 16 parcels eligible; 11 parcels required; 11 parcels signed.*
3. The Planning Commission has established guidelines for applications for nonconforming use permits for duplexes. While not themselves requirements, these guidelines lay out additional more objective factors the Planning Commission wishes to consider in determining if the required findings for granting nonconforming use permits listed in §62.109 of the Zoning Code can be made. The Planning Commission's Duplex Conversion Guidelines state that for applications for nonconforming use permits for duplexes in residential districts, staff will recommend denial unless the following guidelines are met:
- A. *Lot size of at least 5000 square feet with a lot width or front footage of 40 feet. This finding is met. The lot size is approximately 8,800 sq. ft. and the lot frontage on Geranium is 50 feet.*
 - B. *Gross living area, after completion of duplex conversion, of at least 1,500 square feet. Neither unit shall be smaller than 500 square feet. This condition is met. The units are approximately 1,075 square feet each.*
 - C. *Three off-street parking spaces (non-stacked) are preferred; two spaces are the required minimum. This condition can be met. There is only one off-street parking space, in the existing attached garage, serving the use. There is also plenty of room along Arkwright to place a parking pad. However, the property is located on a corner lot and on-street parking on Geranium and Arkwright is adequate to serve the use.*
 - D. *All remodeling work for the duplex is on the inside of the structure unless the plans for exterior changes are approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals as part of the variance. (The Planning Commission will approve these changes for the cases they handle.) This condition is met. Other than exterior finishing, all remodeling work will take place inside the structure.*
 - E. *For the purpose of protecting the welfare and safety of the occupants of any structure that has been converted into a duplex without the necessary permits, a code compliance inspection shall be conducted and the necessary permits obtained to bring the entire structure into conformance with building and fire code standards; or the property owner must, as a condition of the approval, make the necessary improvements to obtain the necessary permits and bring the entire structure into building and fire code compliance within the time specified in the resolution. This condition is met. The applicant will work with the Department of Safety and Inspections to obtain the necessary code compliance documentation and permits.*

The application for the permit shall include the petition, a site plan meeting the requirements of section 61.401, floor plans, and other information as required to substantiate the permit. This finding is met. The applicant has submitted sufficient documentation to substantiate the permit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Saint Paul Planning Commission, under the authority of the City's Legislative Code, that the application of Nuchami Hurshuajer for a Re-Establishment of nonconforming use as a duplex at 393 Geranium Ave E is hereby approved subject to the condition that the applicant adhere to all applicable code requirements and receives a certificate of occupancy for a two-unit building.

city of saint paul
planning commission resolution
file number
date

WHEREAS, Capitol Lien and Title, File # 11-129-965, has applied for a determination of similar use for vertical wind turbines in the B3 general business district under the provisions of § 61.106 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code, on property located at 1010 Dale St. N, Parcel Identification Number (PIN) 25-29-23-23-0063, legally described as Como Prospect Addition, Lots 3-5, Block 13; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission, on May 19 and June 16, 2011, held a public hearing at which all persons present were given an opportunity to be heard pursuant to said application in accordance with the requirements of §61.303 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code; and

WHEREAS, the Saint Paul Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented to its Zoning Committee at the public hearing as substantially reflected in the minutes, made the following findings of fact:

1. Capitol Lien and Title proposes installing four vertical wind turbines, three building-mounted wind turbines and one on a freestanding pole, as an accessory use to provide electricity for the business at 1010 N. Dale Street. The three proposed roof-mounted 1.5 kW turbines would extend 15.8 ft. above the surface of the roof (a 9.8 ft. tall turbine mounted on a 6 ft. monopole). The proposed freestanding 3 kW turbine itself is 18.4 ft. tall. It would be mounted on a 13 ft. monopole, for a total height of 31.4 feet.
2. § 61.106 authorizes the planning commission to make similar use determinations when a specific use is not listed in the zoning code. The proposed wind turbines as an accessory use to provide electricity for the business at 1010 N. Dale Street generally meet the definition of *accessory use* in § 65.910, "a building, structure or use which is clearly incidental to, customarily found in connection with, and (except as provided in section 63.300) located on the same zoning lot as, the principal use to which it is related." While § 60.103(k) of the zoning code states that a purpose of the zoning code is "to promote the conservation of energy and the utilization of renewable energy resources," suggesting that the zoning code generally supports permitting wind turbines, § 65.910 does not specifically include wind turbine in a list of examples of what the term accessory use includes but is not limited to. Therefore, § 65.910 also does not include any specific standards for wind turbines in various zoning districts.

On April 15, 2011, the planning commission initiated a zoning study to consider amendments to the zoning code pertaining to wind turbines that will address issues specific to wind turbines and conditions under which wind turbines would be permitted in various zoning districts. Preliminary research finds that small wind turbines designed to provide electricity for the property on which they are located are commonly permitted as accessory uses in other cities, subject to reasonable conditions that may vary dependent on the size and location of the turbine. Minneapolis, Duluth, Madison and Chicago all have specific provisions for this.

moved by _____
seconded by _____
in favor _____
against _____

Minneapolis permits administrative approval of accessory building-mounted systems in all zoning districts, up to 15 feet in height above the roof, including on residential buildings at least 4 stories tall. Minneapolis also requires that building-mounted systems "shall be set back at least ten (10) feet from the front, side and rear walls of the structure upon which it would be mounted." Chicago has a similar height standard for building-mounted systems in residential districts, 15 feet above the rooftop or parapet, whichever is greater.

Minneapolis permits freestanding systems as a conditional use, up to 60 feet high on zoning lots between one and five acres in residential and commercial districts, and requires a set back of at least twice the height of the tower from residential structures and overhead utility lines.

Duluth permits wind energy conversion systems both as a principal and as an accessory use. As an accessory use the height can not exceed 50 feet without a special use permit. Duluth exempts wind energy conversion systems for regular zoning district height limits, requires freestanding systems to be set back from property lines at least as far as the tower height, and requires the lowest point of the rotor to be at least 15 feet above the ground.

Finish is also regulated in Duluth: "The turbine and tower shall remain painted or finished in the color that was originally applied by the manufacturer." Minneapolis requires materials and colors that are compatible with the principal structure, prevent communication signal interference, and blend into the surroundings as much as possible.

The Boston, MA, code talks about minimizing glare and flickering shadows, and requires the applicant to show that this would not have significant impact on neighboring uses.

Bat and bird impacts are not specifically mentioned in any codes currently established in the US. However, there have been some studies that suggest that at large wind sites anywhere from 1 to 3 birds are killed per tower per year. Bats experience a kill rate of almost three times that. For most urban applications wind turbines are mounted lower than bird and bat migration paths. "Because of the relatively smaller blades and short tower heights, home-sized wind machines are considered too small and too dispersed to present a threat to birds. Researchers do not consider a study of home-sized wind systems worth funding." (focusonenergy.com) No research was found about birds or bats and vertical wind turbines. An industry representative has stated that vertical wind turbines appear to be solid objects when spinning, which would cause birds and bats to fly around them, rather than try to go through them. There is no evidence to suggest that vertical wind turbines create enough disturbances in the wind to draw birds or bats in to them.

3. § 61.106 states that in making a similar use determination the planning commission shall make the following findings:

- (a) *That the use is similar in character to one (1) or more of the principal uses permitted.*

Antennas permitted in the B3 general business district share some characteristics with a vertical wind turbine: both may be mounted on a building roof or on a freestanding pole.

§63.121 permits accessory antennas in all districts, including a television receiving satellite dish 3 meters or less in diameter and short-wave radio antennas, to extend up to 15 feet above the normal height restriction for the district (e.g., 15 feet above the 30 foot height limit in the B3 district). While antennas are static objects and do not create sound, by their nature wind turbines have dynamic, moving elements. Other uses permitted in the B3 district include outdoor elements that move or create sound. Outdoor compressors and chillers accessory to a grocery store or restaurant, for example, create sound. Auto service stations and drive-through sales and services permitted in the B3 district often include outdoor elements that create sound.

- (b) *That the traffic generated on such use is similar to one (1) or more of the principal uses permitted.* This finding can be made. The minimal traffic generated by wind turbines is substantially less than most uses permitted in the B3 district.
 - (c) *That the use is not first permitted in a less restrictive zoning district.* This finding is made. "Wind turbine" is not specifically listed as a permitted use in any zoning district.
 - (d) *The use is consistent with the comprehensive plan.* This finding is made. While the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan does not contain any policies specifically related to wind turbines, the use is consistent with broad policies in the comprehensive plan for energy conservation and sustainable use of renewable energy resources. The proposed wind turbines are consistent with the intent and purpose of the zoning code "to implement the policies of the comprehensive plan," including the purpose specifically stated in § 60.103(k) of the zoning code "to promote the conservation of energy and the utilization of renewable energy resources."
4. Because vertical wind turbines share some characteristics with cellular telephone antennas, it may be useful to consider the standards for cellular telephone antennas in the B3 district. §65.310 provides for cellular telephone antennas in the B3 general business district as permitted uses if they are building-mounted and as conditional uses if they are freestanding. The standards and conditions listed in § 65.310 for cellular telephone antennas in the B3 general business district that might also be applicable to the proposed wind turbines, and the consistency of the proposed wind turbines with them, are as follows:
- (b) *In . . . OS-B3 . . . business districts, the antennas shall not extend more than fifteen (15) feet above the structural height of the structure to which they are attached.* The proposed roof-mounted wind turbines are reasonably consistent with this standard. The applicant proposes to mount the turbines on 6 foot monopoles to protect the turbines and to protect people on the roof from bumping into the turbines. The turbines themselves are 9.8 feet high. Together with a 6 foot pole, the top of the turbines would be 15.8 feet above the roof surface itself, and 14.3 feet above the top of the 18 inch parapet.
 - (d) *In . . . business districts, cellular telephone antennas to be located on a new freestanding pole are subject to the following standards and conditions:*
 - (1) *The freestanding pole shall not exceed seventy-five (75) feet in height, unless the applicant demonstrates that the surrounding topography, structures, or vegetation renders a seventy-five-foot pole impractical. Freestanding poles may exceed the above height limit by twenty-five (25) feet if the pole is designed to carry two (2) antennas.* The proposed 31.4 foot tall wind turbine on a free-standing pole is consistent with this standard.
 - (2) *Antennas shall not be located in a required front or side yard and shall be set back one (1) times the height of the antenna plus ten (10) feet from the nearest residential structure.* The wind turbine is not located in a required front or side yard. The location of the proposed pole is 51 feet from the nearest residential property, and farther from the nearest residential structure, consistent with this standard.
 - (3) *The antennas shall be designed where possible to blend into the surrounding environment through the use of color and camouflaging architectural treatment.* The proposed wind turbine and pole would have non-reflective subdued finishes to blend into the surrounding environment as much as possible. They would also be located to reduce their visual impact.

- (4) *In business districts, the zoning lot on which the pole is located shall be within contiguous property with OS or less restrictive zoning at least one (1) acre in area. The lot is within a large contiguous area of B3 and industrial zoning consistent with this standard.*
- (g) *Freestanding poles shall be a monopole design. The proposed freestanding pole is a monopole design consistent with this standard.*
- (h) *Transmitting, receiving and switching equipment shall be housed within an existing structure whenever possible. If a new equipment building is necessary, it shall be permitted and regulated as an accessory building, section 63.500, and screened from view by landscaping where appropriate. The applicant states that all electrical equipment related to the wind turbines will be located in the existing building, and wires from the freestanding turbine to the electrical equipment will be buried.*
5. § 65.310 provides for cellular telephone antennas on a freestanding pole in the B3 district as a conditional use. Because the proposed vertical wind turbine on a freestanding pole shares some characteristics with a cellular telephone antenna on a freestanding pole, it may be useful to review the proposed wind turbine on a freestanding pole for conformance with the general standards in § 61.501 that apply to approval of conditional use permits:
- (a) *The extent, location and intensity of the use will be in substantial compliance with the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan and any applicable subarea plans which were approved by the city council. The wind turbine is consistent with this standard as stated in Finding 3(d).*
- (b) *The use will provide adequate ingress and egress to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets. The turbine will generate minimal traffic and is consistent with this standard.*
- (c) *The use will not be detrimental to the existing character of the development in the immediate neighborhood or endanger the public health, safety and general welfare. Based on the information provided in the application, the impact of potential sound created by the proposed wind turbines on the character and welfare of the immediate area is unclear.*

The impact of sound generated by wind turbines is affected by a number of variables. In order for a sound to be heard over ambient noise it must be at least twice as loud as the ambient noise. Noise monitoring found that the sound generated by the 10 kW turbine at Macalester, for example, was imperceptible because of ambient noise in the area. Sound generated by the turbines increases with wind speed, while increased wind also increases ambient noise. Sound decreases 6 dB(A) for each doubling of distance from the source. Cumulative sound is measured logarithmically. For example, two things making sound at 50 dB(A) would have a cumulative sound level of 53dB(A) and four would generate a sound level of 56 dB(A).

Based on data provided by the applicant, sound from the 3000 watt wind turbine is 55 dB(A) at a wind speed of 11 miles per hour and 65 dB(A) at a wind speed 22 miles per hour. A speed limiter starts at a wind speed of 28 mph, and the turbine shuts down at a wind speed of 33 miles per hour. Based on the data provided, it appears that the turbine would meet the L10 (10% of an hour) city noise limit standard of 70 dB(A) for commercial districts. The city noise standard in residential districts is an L10 of 65dB(A) in the daytime (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) and an L10 of 55dB(A) at night (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.). Also, the Minnesota noise pollution rules for residential areas have an L50 (50% of an hour) standard of 60 dB(A) in the daytime and an L50 of 50 dB(A) at night. These are measured at the point of nearest human activity. Based on the data provided and the distance to residential property, it appears that the turbine may meet the 65 dB(A) daytime city noise standard for residential districts. While

wind generally blows at a lower speed in the night time, the proposed turbines are close enough to the point of nearest human activity on residential property that these standards could be violated, particularly with the cumulative sound of the four proposed turbines.

§ 293.08(b) of the Saint Paul Legislative Code states that any city department or agency may require a noise impact statement in association with any change in zoning classification, in planning of a structure, or in any operation, process, installation or alteration which may be considered as a potential noise source. Such a noise impact analysis performed by an acoustical engineer could suggest changes to the number or location of the proposed wind turbines, or other mitigation measures, as necessary to conform to the city and state noise standards, and thus protect the character and welfare of the area.

(d) The use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district. The proposed wind turbine is consistent with this standard.

(e) The use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located. The proposed wind turbine is consistent with this standard.

6. § 61.107 of the zoning code states that "the planning commission . . . may impose such reasonable conditions and limitations in . . . making a similar use determination, as are determined to be necessary to fulfill the spirit and purpose of the zoning code, to ensure compliance, and to protect adjacent properties."

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Saint Paul Planning Commission, under the authority of the City's Legislative Code, based on findings above, that the application of Capitol Lien and Title for a determination of similar use for three 1.5 kW roof-mounted vertical wind turbines (with a height of 15.8 feet above the roof surface) and one 3.0 kW vertical wind turbine on a freestanding pole (with a total height of 31.4 feet) in the parking lot, in the B3 general business district, or a less restrictive district, at 1010 N. Dale Street is hereby approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The turbines shall be an accessory use to provide electricity for the business on the property.
2. The lot shall be at least 18,000 sq. feet in area, on which there shall be no more than four turbines, including no more than three on the roof and no more than one on a freestanding pole.
3. Roof-mounted turbines shall be no more than 15 feet above the rooftop or parapet, whichever is greater, and centered at least 20 feet from the edge of the building.
4. The wind turbine on a freestanding pole shall have a total height of no more than 32 feet.
5. The turbines shall be centered at least 50 feet from any residentially zoned property.
6. The applicant shall provide a noise impact statement to the Zoning Administrator, completed by an acoustical engineer, showing that when in operation, the sound levels from the wind turbines will be in compliance with all city and state noise standards in Saint Paul Legislative Code 293 and Minnesota Rules 7030.
7. This approval shall be for a test period that shall expire on June 24, 2013, after which the applicant may apply for permanent approval under the specific new zoning code language adopted pursuant to the current study of zoning code amendments to address issues specific to wind turbines and conditions under which wind turbines shall be permitted in various zoning districts, or the turbines shall be removed.
8. The applicant shall monitor bird and bat casualties during the test period and provide the monitoring data to the Planning Commission.

**AGENDA
ZONING COMMITTEE
OF THE SAINT PAUL PLANNING COMMISSION
Thursday, June 16, 2011 3:30 P.M.
City Council Chambers
Third Floor City Hall - Saint Paul, Minnesota**

NOTE: The order in which the items appear on this agenda is not necessarily the order in which they will be heard at the meeting. The Zoning Committee will determine the order of the agenda at the beginning of its meeting.

APPROVAL OF JUNE 2, 2011, ZONING COMMITTEE MINUTES

SITE PLAN REVIEW – List of current applications (Tom Beach, 651-266-9086)

OLD BUSINESS

- 1 11-129-965 Capitol Lien & Title**
Determination of similar use for vertical wind turbines in the B3 general business district
1010 Dale St N, between Lawson and Hatch
B3
Kate Reilly 651-266-6618

NEW BUSINESS

- 2 11-149-363 Nuchami Hurshuajer**
Re-Establishment of nonconforming use as a duplex
393 Geranium Ave E, NW corner at Arkwright
R4
Sarah Zorn 651-266-6570
- 3 11-148-456 City House (Re-est)**
Re-establishment of nonconforming use as a reception hall in the FW Floodway District
258 Mill St, south side of intersection of Walnut and Mill Street
TN3M
Josh Williams 651-266-6659
- 4 11-148-409 City House (CUP)**
Conditional Use Permit for a reception hall
258 Mill St, south side of intersection of Walnut and Mill Street
TN3M
Josh Williams 651-266-6659

ADJOURNMENT

ZONING COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Call Patricia James at 266-6639 or Samantha Langer at 266-6550 if you are unable to attend the meeting.

APPLICANT: You or your designated representative must attend this meeting to answer any questions that the committee may have.

Transportation Committee Staff Report

Committee date: June 13, 2011

Project Name	<i>Saint Paul Submissions for Regional Solicitation of Federal Transportation Projects</i>
Geographic Scope	<i>Citywide</i>
Ward(s)	<i>n/a</i>
District Council(s)	<i>n/a</i>
Project Description	<i>The Metropolitan Council is soliciting applications for federal transportation funding. The 2011 Regional Solicitation includes STP, CMAQ, Enhancements, and Bridge Replacement Improvement.</i>
Project Contact	<i>Emily Goodman</i>
Contact email/phone	<i>Emily.goodman@ci.stpaul.mn.us, 651.266.6059</i>
Lead Agency/Department	<i>Public Works</i>
Purpose of Project/Plan	<i>To submit for funding of transportation projects</i>
Planning References	<i>T1.4 Implement reconstruction projects for improved safety. T3.5 Support existing off-street shared-use paths and add facilities and amenities supportive of active living principles.</i>
Project stage	<i>Funding application</i>
General Timeline	<i>The solicitation will be formally released on May 12, 2011 and applications will be due July 18, 2011.</i>
District Council position (if applicable)	<i>No District Councils have commented on the proposed submissions at this time.</i>
Level of Committee Involvement	<i>Advise and consent</i>
Previous Committee action	<i>Transportation Committee discussed this list on May 16</i>
Level of Public Involvement	<i>None at this time</i>
Public Hearing	<i>No</i>
Public Hearing Location	<i>City Council</i>
Primary Funding Source(s)	<i>Federal transportation dollars</i>
Cost	<i>The City will have to match funded applications.</i>

Staff recommendation	<i>Approve list of projects</i>
Action item requested of the Committee	<i>Approval of project list</i>
Committee recommendation	<i>Approval, with request for more detailed project information</i>
Committee vote	<i>7-0</i>

Level of Committee Involvement

INFORM: Informational briefings	<i>Projects that are in implementation phase; projects from other jurisdictions; policy documents from other agencies/jurisdictions</i>
ADVISE AND CONSENT: Informational briefings with policy discussion, general directives to staff for follow-through	<i>Project and program reviews primarily initiated by staff; or involvement with program development by others</i>
INVOLVE: Discussions to develop directions for projects & programs	<i>Policy involvement from inception through design, inc. policy development; environmental documentation,</i>
DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT/PROGRAM: <i>Discussion to form process; screening of ideas; development of recommendations; and managing outreach to the community</i>	<i>Committee has primary responsibility for concept development, and/or overseeing participation process, and/or making specific recommendations to Planning Commission, Mayor and/or City Council</i>

city of saint paul
planning commission resolution
file number
date

Regional Solicitation of Federal Transportation Projects

WHEREAS, the Twin Cities region has been allocated Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), Transportation Enhancement Program (TEP) and Bridge Replacement (BIR) funds under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU); and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Council is soliciting projects to be funded under STP, CMAQ, and TEP and the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) is soliciting projects for funding through BIR funds; and

WHEREAS, this solicitation will award Federal funds for projects or programs for Federal Fiscal Years 2015 or 2016; and

WHEREAS, projects approved for SAFETEA-LU funding will require the submitting agency to provide a local match of at least twenty percent; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Parks and Recreation, Planning and Economic Development, and Public Works have reviewed the qualifying and ranking criteria for the STP, CMAQ, TEP, and BIR programs, and based on the qualifying criteria, city programs, plans, and needs, submit the projects or programs on ATTACHMENT "A" for submittal to the Metropolitan Council or Mn/DOT for review, rating, and recommendation for SAFETEA-LU funding; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Committee reviewed and approved the projects on ATTACHMENT "A";

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission recommends to the City Council the proposed projects or programs listed in ATTACHMENT "A" be submitted to the Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT for review and possible funding.

moved by _____

seconded by _____

in favor _____

against _____



CITY OF SAINT PAUL

Christopher B. Coleman, Mayor

*25 West Fourth Street
Saint Paul, MN 55102*

*Telephone: 651-266-6700
Facsimile: 651-228-3220*

MEMORANDUM

To: Planning Commission
From: Christina Morrison, Staff to the Transportation Committee
Date: June 17, 2011
Re: Regional Solicitation of Federal Transportation Projects

Please note that Attachment A, the proposed project list and descriptions, will be sent separately on Tuesday, June 21.